arXiv:hep-ph/9302228v1 6 Feb 1993

SCIPP-92/42
WIS-92/61/Dec-PH
Revised Version
January, 1993

# $Z \to A^0 A^0 \nu\bar{\nu}$ and $e^+e^- \to A^0 A^0 Z$ in Two Higgs Doublet Models

Howard E. Haber ⋆
*Santa Cruz Institute for Particle Physics*
*University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064*

Yosef Nir †
*Weizmann Institute of Science*
*Physics Department, Rehovot 76100, Israel*

**Abstract**

In LEP searches for the neutral CP-odd scalar $A^0$ of a multi-Higgs doublet model, experimenters have searched for $Z \to h^0 A^0$ (where $h^0$ is the lightest CP-even scalar). No model-independent limit on the $A^0$ mass can be deduced from present data if $m_{h^0} > m_Z$. In this paper, we compute the rates for $Z \to A^0 A^0 \nu\bar{\nu}$ and $e^+e^- \to A^0 A^0 Z$. Assuming that no light CP-even neutral scalars exist,the branching ratio for $Z \to A^0 A^0 \nu\bar{\nu}$ is found to be less than $1.4 \times 10^{-8}$. At higher $e^+e^-$ center-of-mass energies, $\sigma(e^+e^- \to A^0 A^0 Z)$ peaks at 0.5 fb. A comparison with other direct searches for the $A^0$ is briefly considered.

Submitted to *Physics Letters B*

⋆ Supported in part by the Department of Energy.
† Incumbent of the Ruth E. Recu Career Development Chair supported in part by the Israel Commission for Basic Research, by the United States—Israel Binational Science Foundation, and by the Minerva Foundation.

# 1. Introduction

The simplest extension of the scalar sector of the Standard Model is a model with two complex scalar Higgs doublets (with a CP-conserving Higgs sector) [1]. This model possesses five physical scalars: two neutral CP-even scalars ($h^0$ and $H^0$ with $m_{h^0} \leq m_{H^0}$), one neutral CP-odd scalar ($A^0$) and a charged pair of scalars ($H^\pm$). In a generic (CP-conserving) two-Higgs-doublet model, the four masses $m_{h^0}$, $m_{H^0}$, $m_{A^0}$ and $m_{H^\pm}$ are independent parameters. Moreover, the scalar couplings to vector bosons and fermions depend on two additional independent parameters of the model: the ratio of vacuum expectation values ($\tan\beta$) and the CP-even Higgs mixing angle ($\alpha$). This makes the experimental search for the various Higgs scalars a complicated task.

The fact that the charged scalars have not been observed in $Z$ decays puts an unambiguous lower bound on their masses, $m_{H^\pm} \geq 41.7$ GeV [2,3]. The Higgs search is more complicated in the case of the neutral scalars. The $Z$-boson does not couple to a pair of identical scalars but only to $h^0A^0$ and $H^0A^0$. The relative coupling strengths are $\cos(\beta-\alpha)$ and $\sin(\beta-\alpha)$ respectively, which in the general two-doublet model is independent of the Higgs masses. Thus, if $m_{h^0} \geq m_Z$ or if $|\cos(\beta-\alpha)| \ll 1$ and $m_{H^0} \geq m_Z$, then associated production of $A^0$ in $Z$ decay could not have been observed even if $A^0$ were massless! Experimental limits on $A^0$ that do not depend on the other Higgs mass parameters of the theory are meager. There are no official limits in the 1992 compilation of the Particle Data Group [4]. Presumably, combining results from searches for $K \to \pi A^0$, $B \to KA^0$, $\psi \to A^0\gamma$ and $\Upsilon \to A^0\gamma$ would rule out very light CP-odd scalars [5,6]. However, no general $m_{A^0}$ bound above a few GeV exists today.

Sharper bounds on $m_{A^0}$ do exist in the minimal supersymmetric extension of the Standard Model (MSSM). The Higgs sector of the MSSM is a two-Higgs-doublet model in which the Higgs parameters are highly constrained [7]. As a result, one finds tree-level relations among the various Higgs sector parameters which reduce the six independent parameters mentioned above to two independent

parameters. These relations are modified when radiative corrections are incorporated [8-11]. Nevertheless, the MSSM constraints permit a much more powerful set of experimental bounds to be obtained by the non-observation of $Z \to h^0\nu\bar{\nu}$ and $Z \to h^0A^0$. The present LEP bound on $A^0$ in the context of the MSSM is $m_{A^0} \geq 20$ GeV (assuming $\tan\beta \gtrsim 1$) [3,12].

In this paper, we consider the possibility of excluding a light $A^0$ in the general (CP-conserving) non-supersymmetric two-Higgs-doublet model. We examine the extreme case in which the CP-odd neutral scalar $A^0$ is light, but all other scalars are heavy (say, with masses above the $e^+e^-$ collider center-of-mass energy).$^\star$ We then pose the following question: is it possible to find (or exclude) the $A^0$ in a completely model-independent way? Since the other Higgs scalars are assumed to be heavy, the $A^0$ must be produced either through its couplings to fermions or vector bosons. The Higgs-fermion interaction is model-dependent; the $A^0f\bar{f}$ coupling strength depends on $\tan\beta$. On the other hand, the four-point couplings of $A^0A^0$ to $W^+W^-$ and $ZZ$ and their respective coupling strengths are fixed by the gauge invariance of the theory. Thus, we shall restrict our attention in this paper to $A^0$ production processes that only involve the $A^0$ couplings to vector bosons.

In section 2, we study the decay mode $Z \to A^0A^0\nu\bar{\nu}$ shown in Fig. 1. The $\nu\bar{\nu}$ pair arises from decay products of a virtual $Z$-boson. Our results can be easily extended to other pairs of light fermions arising from the virtual $Z$. If the heavier Higgs bosons of the model are sufficiently heavy, then the Feynman diagram of Fig. 1 is the only relevant tree-level diagram. If $m_{A^0} = 0$, we can compute the decay rate explicitly by analytically integrating over the four-body phase space. This provides an upper limit for the decay rate. We have also carried out the more general computation for $m_{A^0} \neq 0$ where the phase space integration must be carried out numerically. In section 3, we compute the cross section for $e^+e^- \to A^0A^0Z$. This process proceeds via a diagram similar to the one shown in fig. 1, except that the roles of the real $Z$ and virtual $Z^*$ are reversed. The end results of both

$\star$ The case where $m_{A^0} \ll m_Z$ and all other Higgs states are heavier than the $Z$ is not possible in the MSSM.

calculations are disappointing; the respective branching ratio and cross-sections are too small to be detected at LEP (and LEP-200). Finally, in section 4, we compare our result with other direct searches for the $A^0$.

## 2. Computation of $\Gamma(Z \to A^0 A^0 \nu\bar{\nu})$

In this section, we compute the contribution of Fig. 1 to $Z \to A^0 A^0 \nu\bar{\nu}$. The rate depends on the $ZZAA$ coupling which in the two-Higgs doublet model is given by

$$g_{Z_\mu Z_\nu A^0 A^0} = \frac{ig^2}{2\cos^2\theta_W} g_{\mu\nu}\,. \tag{1}$$

Note in particular that this coupling does not depend on the Higgs sector parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$. Thus, the decay rate we compute will depend only on one unknown parameter—the mass of the $A^0$.

The amplitude for $Z(p) \to A^0(k_1)A^0(k_2)\nu(k_3)\bar{\nu}(k_4)$ (with the four-momenta indicated in parentheses) in unitary gauge is

$$i\mathcal{M} = \frac{ig^2}{2\cos^2\theta_W}\epsilon^\mu(p)\frac{-i\left(g_{\mu\nu} - \kappa_\mu\kappa_\nu/m_Z^2\right)}{\kappa^2 - m_Z^2}\bar{u}(k_3)\left(\frac{-ig}{4\cos\theta_W}\right)\gamma^\nu(1-\gamma_5)v(k_4)\,, \tag{2}$$

where $\kappa \equiv k_3 + k_4$ is the four-momentum of the virtual $Z$. The decay width is then

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(Z \to A^0 A^0 \nu\bar{\nu}) &= \frac{g^6}{96(2\pi)^8 m_Z^3\cos^6\theta_W}\int\frac{d^3k_3}{2E_3}\frac{d^3k_4}{2E_4}\frac{1}{(2k_3\cdot k_4 - m_Z^2)^2} \\ &\times\int\frac{d^3k_1}{2E_1}\frac{d^3k_2}{2E_2}\left[m_Z^2(k_3\cdot k_4) + 2(k_3\cdot p)(k_4\cdot p)\right]\delta^{(4)}(p-k_1-k_2-k_3-k_4)\,,\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where we have included a factor of $\frac{1}{2}$ to account for identical $A^0$ bosons in the final

state and a factor of $\frac{1}{3}$ for the $Z$ spin-average. To integrate over $d^3k_1 d^3k_2$ we use[†]

$$\int \frac{d^3k_1}{2E_1}\frac{d^3k_2}{2E_2}\delta^{(4)}(N-k_1-k_2)\times\begin{cases} 1 & = \frac{\pi}{2}R_4^{1/2}, \\ k_{1\mu} & = \frac{\pi}{4}R_4^{1/2}N_\mu, \\ k_{1\mu}k_{1\nu} & = -\frac{\pi}{24}R_4^{1/2}(R_4N^2g_{\mu\nu} - 4R_1N_\mu N_\nu), \\ k_{1\mu}k_{2\nu} & = \frac{\pi}{24}R_4^{1/2}(R_4N^2g_{\mu\nu} + 2R_{-2}N_\mu N_\nu), \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

where $N$ is an arbitrary four-vector and

$$R_n \equiv 1 - \frac{nm_{A^0}^2}{N^2}\,. \tag{5}$$

Applying this result to eq. (3), we find

$$\Gamma(Z \to AA\nu\bar{\nu}) = \frac{g^6}{3(4\pi)^7 m_Z^3 \cos^6\theta_W}\int \frac{d^3k_3}{2E_3}\frac{d^3k_4}{2E_4}\left(1 - \frac{4m_{A^0}^2}{(p-k_3-k_4)^2}\right)^{1/2} \times \frac{m_Z^2(k_3\cdot k_4) + 2(k_3\cdot p)(k_4\cdot p)}{[2(k_3\cdot k_4) - m_Z^2]^2}. \tag{6}$$

It is convenient to work in the $Z$ rest frame:

$$p = (m_Z; 0, 0, 0); \quad k_3 = E_3(1; 0, 0, 1); \quad k_4 = E_4(1; \sin\theta, 0, \cos\theta), \tag{7}$$

where $E_3$ and $E_4$ are the neutrino energies. We introduce the following scaled kinematic variables

$$v \equiv \frac{4m_{A^0}^2}{m_Z^2}, \quad w \equiv \frac{1-\cos\theta}{2}, \quad y \equiv \frac{2E_3}{m_Z}, \quad z \equiv \frac{2E_4}{m_Z}\,. \tag{8}$$

† Here, we follow the techniques of ref. [13].

Then

$$\Gamma(Z \to AA\nu\bar{\nu}) = \frac{g^6 m_Z}{3 \cdot 2^{17}\pi^5 \cos^6\theta_W} \int_0^{1-v} dz \left[ \int_0^{1-v-z} dy \int_0^1 dw + \int_{1-v-z}^{1-v} dy \int_{(y+z-1+v)/yz}^1 dw \right] \times \frac{y^2 z^2 (1+w)}{(yzw-1)^2} \left( 1 - \frac{v}{1-y-z+yzw} \right)^{1/2} . \tag{9}$$

For a massless $A^0$ ($v = 0$), the square-root factor in eq. (9) is unity, and the remaining integrals can be carried out explicitly. The result is

$$\Gamma(Z \to AA\nu\bar{\nu}) = \frac{g^6 m_Z}{3 \cdot 2^{17}\pi^5 \cos^6\theta_W} \left[ \frac{\pi^2}{2} - \frac{349}{72} \right] . \tag{10}$$

It is unfortunate that the factor in brackets is rather small (roughly 0.09), thereby reducing the partial width by more than an order of magnitude over a naive initial estimate. The branching ratio is most easily displayed by normalizing our result to $\Gamma(Z \to \nu\bar{\nu}) = g^2 m_Z/(96\pi \cos^2\theta_W)$. We find

$$\frac{\Gamma(Z \to A^0 A^0 \nu\bar{\nu})}{\Gamma(Z \to \nu\bar{\nu})} = \frac{\alpha^2 (\frac{\pi^2}{2} - \frac{349}{72})}{256\pi^2 \sin^4\theta_W \cos^4\theta_W} , \tag{11}$$

where $\alpha \simeq 1/128$ is the fine-structure constant evaluated at the $Z$ mass. Noting that the branching ratio for $Z$ decay to three generations of neutrinos is 20.2%, we end up with

$$BR(Z \to A^0 A^0 \nu\bar{\nu}) = 1.4 \times 10^{-8} . \tag{12}$$

For $m_{A^0} \neq 0$ we have carried out the integrations in eq. (9) numerically. The results are presented in Fig. 2. The branching ratio decreases from the result of eq. (12) by about an order of magnitude for $m_{A^0} \sim 15$ GeV and by two orders of magnitude for $m_{A^0} \sim 25$ GeV.

## 3. $e^+e^- \to A^0A^0Z$ at a Higher Energy $e^+e^-$ Collider

In light of the extremely small branching ratios for $Z \to A^0A^0\nu\bar{\nu}$ obtained above, we extend our considerations to future Higgs searches at higher energy $e^+e^-$ colliders (LEP-200 and the next $e^+e^-$ linear collider (NLC) with $\sqrt{s} \geq 300$ GeV). Consider first the search for the lightest CP-even Higgs ($h^0$) at LEP. If $h^0$ is not discovered at LEP-I (say, via $Z \to h^0\nu\bar{\nu}$), then the search will be continued at LEP-II via $e^+e^- \to h^0Z$. Once the light CP-even Higgs state is found, one can, in principle, place unambiguous bounds on the existence of $A^0$ if $e^+e^- \to h^0A^0$ is not observed. On the other hand, suppose that $h^0$ is still not discovered. Is it possible that a rather light $A^0$ could still elude experimental detection?

It might be argued that it is theoretically unlikely that $A^0$ is light while the lightest CP-even scalar is quite heavy. This prejudice is common among advocates of low-energy supersymmetry models [14]. In contrast, light CP-odd and heavy CP-even scalars are natural in technicolor models [15]. For example, many technicolor models possess a spectrum of light CP-odd pseudo-Goldstone bosons ("pseudos"); those states that are electrically and color-neutral would behave like the $A^0$ of the two-doublet Higgs model. In contrast, the CP-even scalars would be spin 0 bound states of techni-fermions and would almost certainly be considerably heavier than the light pseudos. Thus, until a CP-even Higgs scalar is discovered, it will be important to study methods for discovering the $A^0$ in processes that do not involve the CP-even scalars.

In analogy with the search for the CP-even scalar at LEP-200, we consider the mechanism for $A^0A^0$ production shown in fig. 1, where the role of the $Z$ and $Z^*$ are interchanged. That is, we consider $e^+e^- \to A^0A^0Z$ via $s$-channel $Z^*$-exchange. Here, we assume that all other Higgs scalars are much heavier than the $e^+e^-$ center-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s}$ so that other contributing tree-level diagrams mediated by the heavier CP-even scalars can be omitted. In this case, only the one diagram contributes. The squared matrix element for $e^+e^- \to A^0A^0Z$, averaged

(summed) over initial (final) spins is given by:

$$|\mathcal{M}|^2_{\rm ave} = \frac{g^6[1-4\sin^2\theta_W+8\sin^4\theta_W]}{64m_Z^2\cos^6\theta_W(s-m_Z^2)^2}\ \left[m_Z^2 s + 4p_1\cdot k_Z\, p_2\cdot k_Z\right]\ , \qquad (13)$$

where $p_1$, $p_2$ and $k_Z$ are the $e^-$, $e^+$, and $Z$ four-momenta respectively. In evaluating the cross-section for $e^+e^-\to A^0A^0Z$, we make use of eq. (4) in the integration over the three-body phase space. This leaves one last integral over the three-momentum of the $Z$. At this point it is convenient to work in the $e^+e^-$ center-of-mass frame. In this frame, the energy of the $Z$ is $E_Z=(s+m_Z^2-s_2)/2\sqrt{s}$ where $s_2$ is the invariant mass of the $A^0A^0$ pair recoiling against the $Z$ [16]. From $4m_{A^0}^2\le s_2\le(\sqrt{s}-m_Z)^2$, we easily obtain the limits of integration for the variable $E_Z$. Introducing the scaled variables:

$$v\equiv\frac{4m_{A^0}^2}{s},\quad x\equiv\frac{m_Z}{\sqrt{s}},\quad y\equiv\frac{E_Z}{\sqrt{s}}\,, \qquad (14)$$

we end up with:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(e^+e^-\to A^0A^0Z) &= \frac{g^6s^2[1-4\sin^2\theta_W+8\sin^4\theta_W]}{3\cdot 2^{12}\pi^3\cos^6\theta_W m_Z^2(s-m_Z^2)^2}\\ &\times\int_x^{\frac{1}{2}(1+x^2-v)} dy\,(y^2-x^2)^{1/2}(y^2+2x^2)\left(1-\frac{v}{1+x^2-2y}\right)^{1/2}.\end{aligned} \qquad (15)$$

In the above formula, we have already integrated over the angular direction of the $Z$, and we have included the factor of $\frac{1}{2}$ due to identical $A^0$ bosons in the final state. Once again, we can perform the final integral analytically when $m_{A^0}=0$. The result is

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(e^+e^-\to A^0A^0Z) &= \frac{g^6s^2[1-4\sin^2\theta_W+8\sin^4\theta_W]}{3\cdot 2^{18}\pi^3\cos^6\theta_W m_Z^2(s-m_Z^2)^2}\\ &\times\left[(1-x^4)(1+16x^2+x^4)+72x^4\ln x\right].\end{aligned} \qquad (16)$$

It is perhaps surprising that in the limit of large $s$, these cross-sections approach a constant value rather than behaving like $1/s$ as expected for annihilation cross-

sections. This behavior arises from the production of a longitudinal $Z$ in the final state. Moreover, had we included the other tree-level contributions involving the exchange of the CP-even scalars (both $h^0$ and $H^0$), we would find that the leading $\mathcal{O}(1)$ behavior of the cross-section cancels exactly, leaving the expected $\mathcal{O}(1/s)$ behavior. We have checked explicitly that this cancellation does occur. This means that eq. (15) and (16) can only be accurate for $\sqrt{s}$ smaller than the CP-even scalar masses; for larger values of $\sqrt{s}$, these formulae must overestimate the true results.

We now turn to the numerical implications of the above results. In fig. 3, we plot the cross-section for $e^+e^- \to A^0A^0Z$ as a function of the center-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s}$ for three choices of $m_{A^0}$. We also exhibit the dependence on $m_{A^0}$ for possible energies of LEP-200 and the NLC (with $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV). The cross-sections are disappointing. At LEP-200, optimistic projections suggest yearly data accumulations of about 500 pb$^{-1}$. This would imply less than one $A^0A^0Z$ event per year, even before detection efficiency and $Z$ branching ratio factors are taken into account. At the NLC, typical design luminosities yield between 20 and 50 fb$^{-1}$ of data per year [17]. In this case, at most a few $A^0A^0Z$ events per year could be detected (after experimental triggers and cuts). Of course, such a search would only be critical if no $h^0$ were discovered at the NLC, as discussed at the beginning of this section.

Finally, for completeness, we note that other production processes for $A^0A^0$ should be considered at the NLC once the center-of-mass is sufficiently large. For example, one can consider $e^+e^- \to A^0A^0W^+W^-$ and $e^+e^- \to A^0A^0ZZ$ where the $A^0A^0$ is emitted from one of the outgoing vector boson lines. In addition, for $\sqrt{s} \geq 500$ GeV, vector boson fusion processes begin to become important. Thus, one should examine $e^+e^- \to A^0A^0\nu\bar{\nu}$ (via $W^+W^-$ fusion) and $e^+e^- \to A^0A^0e^+e^-$ (via $ZZ$ fusion). The cross-sections for all these processes are formally of higher order [$\mathcal{O}(g^8)$] as compared to $e^+e^- \to A^0A^0Z$ considered above. However, the cross-section for the fusion processes increase logarithmically with $\sqrt{s}$ and eventually dominate the annihilation processes. The $W^+W^-$ fusion cross-section

is the largest and was computed in ref. 18. Unfortunately, even at $\sqrt{s} = 2$ TeV, its cross-section appears to be too small for detection at a future $e^+e^-$ linear collider.

## 4. Discussion and Conclusions

The branching ratio for $Z \to A^0A^0\nu\bar{\nu}$ is probably too small to be observed even at a high luminosity $Z$ factory. Including other possible decays of the virtual $Z$ to fermion pairs can only enhance the branching ratio by a factor of 5. Even with 100% detection efficiency, it seems unlikely that the $A^0$ can be detected. Our calculation has assumed the most general (CP-conserving) two-Higgs-doublet model with a light $A^0$ and all other Higgs scalars very heavy. If the other scalars are not all heavy, there are additional diagrams that contribute to $Z \to A^0A^0\nu\bar{\nu}$. We expect an enhancement of the $Z \to A^0A^0\nu\bar{\nu}$ decay rate to be at least an order of magnitude beyond the result of eq. (12), since there is no reason for a similar suppression by the factor $\pi^2/2 - 349/72$ as found in eq. (10). After adding up all diagrams involving the other Higgs states of the model, we would expect a branching ratio perhaps as large as $10^{-6}$. A more complete calculation (in the context of the MSSM) is currently in progress [19]. Such a decay rate may be observable at a future high intensity $Z$ factory. However, a favorable branching ratio would exist only in limited regions of the parameter space. Going to a higher energy $e^+e^-$ collider does not improve the picture substantially. In this case, one would search for $e^+e^- \to A^0A^0Z$. Based on our computations, we would conclude that the production cross sections are not large enough to permit experimental detection at LEP-200. At an even higher energy NLC with a data collection greater than 10 fb$^{-1}$ per year, at most a few signal events per year could be detected. Thus, an unambiguous model-independent limit on the $A^0$ mass seems to be unattainable.

It is instructive to compare the results of this paper with other proposals to search for $A^0$ in rare $Z$ decays. Two comparable decay processes have been studied in the literature: $Z \to A^0A^0A^0$ and $Z \to b\bar{b}A^0$. L.-F. Li has estimated [20] the rate for $Z \to A^0A^0A^0$ via a one-loop box diagram with a t-quark running around

the loop. He estimates $BR(Z \to A^0A^0A^0) \sim 10^{-5}$, although his estimate is rather crude. If this estimate is not overly optimistic, then it clearly presents an excellent chance to obtain an experimental bound on $m_{A^0}$ which is independent of the other Higgs masses of the model. However, there is still some model-dependence in this case, since the amplitude for $Z \to A^0A^0A^0$ (via the $t$-quark loop) depends on the $A^0t\bar{t}$ coupling. This coupling depends on $\tan\beta$ and could be suppressed. Of course, if $h^0$ is not too heavy, then the dominant contribution to $Z \to A^0A^0A^0$ would arise from $Z \to A^0h^{0*}$ in which the virtual $h^{0*}$ decays to $A^0A^0$.

The decay rate for $Z \to b\bar{b}A^0$ also depends on the model-dependent Higgs-fermion coupling. Djouadi, Zerwas and Zunft find $BR(Z \to b\bar{b}A^0) \simeq 3 \times 10^{-4}$ for $m_{A^0} = 10$ GeV and $\tan\beta = 20$ [21]. (This branching ratio scales as $\tan^2\beta$.) Once again, we have the potential for obtaining limits on $A^0$ independent of the masses of the other Higgs scalars of the theory. As before, the model-dependence of the Higgs-fermion coupling still remains. However, if we subscribe to the Model-II Higgs-fermion couplings of ref. [1] (this coupling pattern is the one that appears in the MSSM), then the $A^0$ coupling to $b\bar{b}$ ($t\bar{t}$) is proportional to $\tan\beta$ ($\cot\beta$). Thus, the latter two processes are complimentary. A combined search for $Z \to A^0A^0A^0$ and $Z \to b\bar{b}A^0$ at a future high intensity $Z$ factory could then rule out the possible existence of a light $A^0$. At a higher energy $e^+e^-$ collider (such as the NLC), one can search for both $e^+e^- \to b\bar{b}A^0$ and $e^+e^- \to t\bar{t}A^0$ with similar effect. On the other hand, in the Model-I Higgs-fermion coupling of ref. [1], it is possible that both $A^0$ couplings to $b\bar{b}$ and $t\bar{t}$ are suppressed. This leaves open the possibility that a light $A^0$ could escape experimental detection for the foreseeable future.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge the probing questions of Ehud Duchovni that encouraged us to examine the issues discussed in this work. We also thank Carlos Figueroa for checking some of the calculations presented in this paper.

# REFERENCES


1. For a detailed review of the two-Higgs doublet model and a guide to the literature, see Chapter 4 of: J.F. Gunion, H.E. Haber, G.L. Kane and S. Dawson, *The Higgs Hunter's Guide* (Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA, 1990).

2. D. Decamp *et al.* [ALEPH Collaboration], *Phys. Rep.* **216** (1992) 253.

3. O. Adriani *et al.* [L3 Collaboration], *Phys. Lett.* **B294** (1992) 457.

4. K. Hisaka *et al.* [Particle Data Group], *Phys. Rev.* **D45** (1992) S1.

5. S. Dawson, *Nucl. Phys.* **B339** (1990) 19; Markus E. Lautenbacher, *Nucl. Phys.* **B347** (1990) 120.

6. D. Antreasyan *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B251** (1990) 204.

7. See §4.2 of ref. [1].

8. J.F Gunion and A. Turski, *Phys. Rev.* **D39** (1989) 2701; **D40** (1989) 2333; M.S. Berger, *Phys. Rev.* **D41** (1990) 225.

9. H.E. Haber and R. Hempfling, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66** (1991) 1815; SCIPP-91/33 (1992); Y. Okada, M. Yamaguchi and T. Yanagida, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **85** (1991) 1; *Phys. Lett.* **B262** (1991) 54; J. Ellis, G. Ridolfi and F. Zwirner, *Phys. Lett.* **B257**, 83 (1991); **B258** (1991) 395.

10. R. Barbieri, M. Frigeni and F. Caravaglios *Phys. Lett.* **B258** (1991) 167; A. Yamada, *Phys. Lett.* **B263** (1991) 233; P.H. Chankowski, S. Pokorski and J. Rosiek, *Phys. Lett.* **B274** (1992) 191; **B281** (1992) 100; **B286** (1992) 307; A. Brignole, *Phys. Lett.* **B281** (1992) 284; D.M. Pierce, A. Papadopoulos and S. Johnson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68** (1992) 3678; K. Sasaki, M. Carena and C.E.M Wagner, *Nucl. Phys.* **B381** (1992) 66.

11. A. Brignole, J. Ellis, G. Rudolfi and F. Zwirner, *Phys. Lett.* **B271** (1991) 123; [E: **B273** (1991) 550]; A. Brignole, *Phys. Lett.* **B277** (1992) 313; M.A. Díaz and H.E. Haber, *Phys. Rev.* **D45**(1992) 4246.

12. D. Buskulic *et al.* [ALEPH Collaboration], *Phys. Lett.* **B285** (1992) 309; D. Decamp *et al.* [ALEPH Collaboration], *Phys. Lett.* **B265** (1991) 475; P. Abreu *et al.* [DELPHI Collaboration], *Nucl. Phys.* **B373** (1992) 3; M.Z. Akrawy *et al.* [OPAL Collaboration], *Z. Phys.* **C49** (1991) 1.

13. See Appendix A of Y. Singh, *Phys. Rev.* **161** (1967) 1497, and Appendix D of R.M. Barnett, H.E. Haber and K.S. Lackner, *Phys. Rev.* **D29** (1984) 1990.

14. H.E. Haber and M. Sher, *Phys. Rev.* **D35** (1987) 2206; M. Drees, *Phys. Rev.* **D35** (1987) 2910; J.R. Espinosa and M. Quiros, *Phys. Lett.* **B279** (1992) 92; G.L. Kane, C. Kolda and J.D. Wells, Michigan preprint UM-TH-92-24 (1992).

15. See, *e.g.*, K. Lane, in *Proceedings of the 1982 DPF Snowmass Summer Study on Elementary Particle Physics and Future Facilities*, edited by R. Donaldson, R. Gustafson, and F. Paige (Fermilab, Batavia, Illinois, 1982), p. 222.

16. E. Byckling and K. Kajante, *Particle Kinematics*, (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1973).

17. B. Wiik, in *Physics and Experiments with Linear Colliders* (Volume I), Workshop Proceedings, Saariselkä, Finland, 9-14 September 1991, edited by R. Orava, P. Eerola and M. Nordberg (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992) p. 83. See also the contributions of B. Richter (p. 611), R. Ruth (p. 629), T. Weiland (p. 663), M. Tigner (p. 705), and G.-A. Voss (p. 777) in *op. cit.* (Volume II).

18. J.F. Gunion *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D38** (1988) 3444.

19. E. Duchovni and T. Wlodek, preprint in preparation.

20. L.-F. Li, CMU-HEP-91-10 (1991), presented at the 14th International Warsaw meeting on Elementary Particle Physics, Warsaw, Poland, 27-31 May 1991.

21. A. Djouadi, P.M. Zerwas, and J. Zunft, *Phys. Lett.* **B259** (1991) 175.

# FIGURE CAPTIONS

1) Feynman diagram for $Z \to A^0 A^0 \nu\bar{\nu}$. In the limit where all other Higgs scalars are much heavier than $m_Z$, other contributing tree-level diagrams (mediated by virtual heavy Higgs exchange) can be neglected.

2) Phase space suppression of $Z \to A^0 A^0 \nu\bar{\nu}$ as a function of $m_{A^0}$. $\Gamma_0$ is the corresponding decay rate for $m_{A^0} = 0$; at this point, $BR(Z \to A^0 A^0 \nu\bar{\nu}) = 1.4 \times 10^{-8}$.

3) Cross-section for $e^+e^- \to A^0 A^0 Z$. We exhibit curves in two cases: (a) as a function of $\sqrt{s}$ for $m_{A^0} = 0$, 20 and 40 GeV and (b) as a function of $m_{A^0}$ for $\sqrt{s} = 150$, 175, 200 and 500 GeV.